



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tific study of the facts of the moral life has also its own place and value.

In conclusion, I wish to return to the point from which I started, and apply the view of Ethics which has been stated to the work of Ethical Societies. If the relation between theory and practice is so close as I have sought to maintain, it is needless to inquire too strictly whether an Ethical Society should be specially theoretical or specially practical. No doubt the two sides can be distinguished; and, in a world in which division of labor makes labor more effective, it may sometimes be desirable that one society should devote itself more particularly to the one side, and another more particularly to the other. But it appears to me that the two sides can never be entirely separate. A merely theoretical society, calling itself ethical, would probably end in hair-splitting and self-conceit; a merely practical one, in priggishness and fuss. The counsel of perfection is "Give us both!" To the theorists one might say, "Bring forth fruit, and think not to say, We are Hegel's seed." To the practical man one might say, "Justify the faith that is in you."

J. S. MACKENZIE.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

THE SOCIAL MINISTRY OF WEALTH.

It is the aim of this paper to show that the conquest over nature which has been going on for the past hundred years as manifested in the mechanical devices by which the efficiency of labor is marvellously increased, has placed before the present possibilities of which the past had not the slightest conception, and that it lies within the choice of this generation to say whether or not those possibilities shall be realized. That which makes the present full of hope and promise is the abundance of wealth at its disposal, or, more properly speaking, the efficiency attained by the agencies of production. The secret of wealth is that nature serves gratuitously the

industrial purposes of men. Yet nature is heedless of moral aims. She serves with equal readiness the ignoble passions and the noble aspirations. It lies wholly with the common people to say whether this marvellous industrial organization, which is the peculiar possession of the nineteenth century, shall be made the means of creating a soul-satisfying civilization, or be dissipated in enervating ostentation or aimless display. The future depends upon the choice which is made in this regard. A crisis, whether in the life of an individual, a nation, or a civilization, is usually a very quiet affair. Men and women come and go unmindful that the critical years of the world's history may be bound up in the routine of their daily conduct. It is to impress this fact, and to suggest the proper bearing of the common people towards this critical period in the development of civilization, that attention is called to a consideration of the social ministry of wealth.

Not only does our subject find nobility in that it touches in this manner the possibilities of the future, it gains dignity also from the relation which it bears to the past. It is the fashion to say that the nineteenth century is given over to material aims, that poetry does not flourish where money abounds, and that ideals are crushed beneath the ponderous wheels of machinery. But such sentiments cannot be entertained by one who perceives that the thread of continuity running through all history is the effort on the part of men to attain freedom, and that industrial development is a necessary step towards that end. The truth is, the material civilization of our day is the means by which the prophecy of the past centuries will, if ever, be fulfilled. It is the third step in the attainment of liberty; and the appreciation of this is sufficiently important to warrant brief reference to the first and second steps in the development of human freedom.

There is no civilization of which we have record in which man stood lower in his own estimation than in the Egyptian. He was in this civilization the slave of his surroundings, and the tyranny which nature exercised over him was intrenched in the superstitious beliefs of the Egyptian people. It was a self-imposed slavery of the mind, a slavery which had no justi-

fication except ignorance of the character and origin of natural forces. The emancipation from this slavery came with the cosmogony of Moses, which asserted that God created nature, and that man, the highest fruit of creative power, was to control nature. The old Hebrew religion in its essence is a declaration by man of his supremacy over the natural world about him, and in its logical development came to be an assumption by him of his full and complete responsibility, so far as the affairs of this life are concerned, for what shall befall him. It is this principle which has given character to succeeding centuries. It is the vitality of this principle which has gained for Christian people the custodianship of the world's progressive civilization ; and it is important to observe, since it gives a clearer notion of our own times by connecting this century with the centuries that are gone, that it is this principle of action, this determination of man to make every condition and every force minister to his own development, which gives unity to our history. A careful study will show that the emancipation of the mind of man from the superstitious regard of natural forces is the first step in the attainment of liberty for the human race.

When, in the thirteenth century, the English serf took advantage of the shifting of customs to assert the right of his own personality, he gained what has proved to be the second step in the attainment of liberty, or, as I prefer to state it, in the creation of those conditions which enable man to realize the promise of his birth. The significance of the liberation of the serf lay in the new point of view which it gained. All the great civilizations of the world up to this time had been based on some phase of formal slavery ; that is to say, all recognized a social structure which prescribed the routine of daily conduct for all classes of society. Not even in the dreams of philosophers and prophets was the idea foreshadowed that a condition of universal liberty is essential to greatness, whether of the individual or the nation. Plato based his Republic on slavery, and it was the generally accepted sentiment of Greek philosophy that the misery of millions was justified by the creation of one great man. Now,

I say that the movement of the Middle Ages in Europe, a movement most perfectly seen in the liberation of the serfs in England, is significant because it changed the point of view. It created a new philosophy of life. It brought the conviction that laws, beliefs, rights, duties, indeed everything which makes up what is termed the social structure, do not hold rightful sway over the destinies of man, but that they are instruments to be used by man to command his own destiny. It was, indeed, a deliverance for man to gain so noble a conception of his own dignity as to regard social institutions as self-imposed restraints for the attainment of his ends. The Reformation which gained religious liberty, and the political revolution which resulted in the establishment of popular government, are but incidents in the emancipation of the mind of man from the slavery of superstitious regard for established institutions. I think I do not place too high an estimate on the thirteenth, the fourteenth, the fifteenth, the sixteenth, the seventeenth, and the first half of the eighteenth century, when I say that the conception which they have bequeathed as a permanent possession to the race will prove to be as far reaching in its results as the Mosaic idea respecting the creation of the world. They both declare that a condition of freedom is the birthright of man.

It was at this juncture in the world's history that those events which mark the nineteenth century as different from any previous age made their appearance. How the matter will be presented by the historian of the future, we, of course, cannot say; but one fact may be stated with a fair degree of assurance. At the close of the seventeenth century the great mass of mankind were still in slavery,—at least, they were not in a condition to realize the ideals of living. It is true, man had asserted his worthiness against the intimidations of nature and his right of personality against the restraints of social structure; but his mind was still a serf to the vulgar necessities of physical existence. Leisure to think, time to enjoy, opportunity to grow,—these are the marks of liberty. But the great body of people retired each night in the dulness and apathy which comes only with exhaustive labor. What could

this universal right of the individual to develop his own personality avail, though expressed in the cogent language of the eighteenth century philosophy, while nature bestowed her gifts with so niggardly a hand that life was exhausted in the struggle to live? It was essential, for it lay in the logical unfolding of history, that man should be freed from the burden of toil.

This deliverance, or at least the dawn of this deliverance, came with the era of invention and the century of great industries and corporate organizations. From the beginning of industrial life down to the last quarter of the eighteenth century, the genius of invention had lain dormant. Men were content to rely on muscular forces to perform the drudgery of life. Tools, it is true, were in common use, but machinery lay outside the range of ordinary thinking. It was, I believe, the late Dr. Adolf Held, of Bonn University (whose life, unfortunately for the science of economy, was cut short in the vigor of manhood), who first brought clearly into view the difference between a civilization based on tools and one based on machinery. The former, which relies on the physical powers of man, is limited in its attainment to the general fund of nervous endurance; the latter, which relies on the intelligence of man, knows no limit except the possible limit of natural forces. Permit me to dwell for a moment on this thought, for, unless you appreciate the poetry and prophecy which lie in machinery, you will fail to grasp the social and historical meaning of wealth which is the product of machinery. Regarded in its bearing on the great problem of civilization, machinery means the deliverance of man from the necessity of arduous toil in order to attain the means of satisfying a rational existence, and it works this deliverance by bringing under man's direction the boundless forces of nature. It was Moses who made man the peer of nature and gave him the right to dominion over it; it was reserved to the inventors of our own time to enable man to enter into that dominion and to reduce nature to servitude.

Many writers have endeavored to measure the efficiency of machinery as compared with an industrial society based on

tools, and some of them have done so with a fair degree of success. This, however, has no very direct bearing on our argument. It is the fact of the difference between the two forms of industry, rather than the measure of that difference, which is of importance. The industrial revolution begun in 1760 may not be accomplished as far as results are concerned, but so far as it pertains to the attitude of mind it is an accomplished fact. The new point of view which it has gained is that nature has been taken into the service of man, and, therefore, that man may be relieved from the necessity of arduous and excessive toil. If it be urged that at present machinery is not adequate to produce the means of satisfying the needs of a high conception of life for all men, I may, perhaps, admit the statement. It has, however, nothing to do with my argument. For there is not the slightest indication that the genius of invention is exhausted, and it is quite conceivable that more effective methods than those now practised may be discovered by which to coerce from nature more fruitful service. Such is the ethical mission of science.

For the sake of argument, or rather as a means of discovering our personal obligations in the presence of the opulence which modern industrial methods are placing at our disposal, let it be assumed that the inventor has geared the rays of the sun to the shaft of industry so that power is as free as light. It still remains an open question whether or not this conquest over nature will gain for man the freedom for which his soul longs. Judging from the use that has been made of wealth on the threshold of this era of opulence, it seems doubtful if the passions and petty ambitions of men will permit wealth to fulfil the mission to which it is called by the logic of history. And this brings me to the kernel of what I have to say. The character of civilization built on machinery will be determined not by machinery, but by the purpose of the men and women who compose society. We have not yet proceeded far enough in the era of opulence to permit it to assume a determined and final character. The material of our social structure is yet plastic and may be moulded to fit our desires. It occurs seldom in the history of the world that

the simple wishing of simple men and women will act as a force in giving direction to a civilization, but such is now the case. Commonly the work of destruction must go before that of construction. At present, however, there is placed in our hands unused material with which to build. What is our plan of architecture? What is our ideal of living? It is for us to say what we desire, and our desires will be accomplished.

Since the revolution which has gained and is gaining for the world these marvellous opportunities is an industrial revolution, it is natural to regard the question just presented from the industrial point of view. Of one fact we may be certain: the ministry of wealth must not be a partial but a universal ministry. It was Duchâtel who said, "Were the benefits of civilization partial and not universal, it would be only a bitter mockery and a cruel injustice." This is true, but in the present instance it is not the whole truth. If labor-saving machinery be used so as to provide absolute leisure for the few rather than to save labor for the many, the overthrow of our civilization will be the inevitable result. In this I speak as an economist and after a critical analysis of the causes and tendencies of commercial crises and commercial depressions. Unless the opulence which comes with the gratuitous service of nature results in the lightening of toil and in raising the standard of living for the mass of mankind, the ability to produce wealth which comes with machinery will be destroyed, because the inducement to produce wealth will be paralyzed. The approximate ideal, therefore, in considering the true ministry of wealth, must be an industrial ideal. It must hold in mind the development of that class called the workers.

Never before has the organic character of society been so clearly manifested. We who are well-to-do cannot be indifferent to the interests of those who are less fortunate, were we so inclined. The great body of workers must be ministered to by wealth in order that we ourselves may enjoy the ministry. *Die Lohnfrage ist eine Culturfrage.* This explains why social and industrial questions claim at present so large a share of thought; for, whatever the ideal of civilization enter-

tained, it must be realized through a proper adjustment of industrial relations.

I know of but one man who has ever formulated in clear language the ethical ideal of an industrial civilization. In an essay entitled "Art and Socialism," written to show that true Art will never again make her appearance until what he pleases to call "socialism" shall be established, William Morris lays down the following somewhat startling proposition,—startling when regarded in the light of what the life of the laboring class has been in the past. "In the truly organized society," he says, "labor must be pleasant, and nothing should be made by man's labor which is not worth making." Consider for a moment what a stupendous idea is bound up in this simple phrase. Compare the view which it entertains of work with the view which has prevailed throughout the centuries. It is not, you will observe, that man is to be freed from labor, but from *the burden* of labor, and this is to be accomplished by rendering labor pleasant and worthy.

At this point I fancy I hear some incredulous objector expressing himself in language like the following. This is indeed a poet's dream. Why cannot men who deal with problems be practical and conform their views to the facts of life? Work is necessarily bound up with pain. There are many sorts of work that are disagreeable in themselves. In all ages labor has been held a curse. The earliest recorded law of political economy is, "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread." There is no possible industrial arrangement that can set aside this law; there is no conceivable adjustment that can make work pleasant. Work and pain are synonymous terms, etc., etc., etc.

Such a view respecting labor appears to me to be wholly untrue, or, perhaps better expressed, it finds no reasonable defence in the nature of the case. It is the last of the great superstitions which have enthralled the mind of man, and when its chain is broken, and men have adjusted themselves to the new idea, they will become free indeed. Let us consider for a moment whether work and pain are necessarily bound together. Our argument need not here be arrested

with a consideration of past industrial relations, for we are talking of the present and of the future. There may have been some excuse in the past for joining labor and pain as companions in thought. But in this century, when the inanimate forces of nature are working gratuitously under man's control, there is no excuse for longer holding to such an error.

Whence came this conception of labor? It was born from the union of a false premise respecting man on the one hand, and a false principle of applying labor on the other. The false premise is that men are naturally unequal; the false principle is that labor is extended to cover all the fresh waking hours of a man's life. The political philosophy of the eighteenth century, which gathered into itself the social development of five hundred years, dispelled the first; the inventions of the nineteenth century show that it is dulness on our part to hold longer to the second. It is because, under existing industrial relations, labor is continued until the last hours of the day are actually painful through weariness of the brain and arm that men see in labor only pain and degradation. Men come to think of all work as they think of the last two or three hours of the day. This is natural. A man rises in the morning refreshed by healthful sleep. His impulse is to do, to act. He has a store of vigor to be set free, and he goes to his accustomed work with pleasure, not reluctantly. During the first four hours he works, not knowing that his will is controlling his muscle. Exercise itself is a pleasure. The four hours following are for him, perhaps, a matter of indifference. His superabundant energy may have been exhausted, but he is not yet weary. For every hour that follows his weariness becomes more and more intense, until at length it is only by conscious effort that his will is able to drag his weary muscles through their appointed task. Ask him when he trudges homeward if his day has been a pleasant one. "No," he will reply; "it has been dull, monotonous, painful. Life is not worth living." He forgets the first hours of the day, and remembers only the last. He asserts of all hours of the day, and all days of the year, and

all the years of his life, the experience of the twelfth hour of each day. Does he err in judgment? Is he wrong? No; but we are wrong in accepting his testimony, which is that his labor is to him painful, as proof that all labor is necessarily painful. When labor-saving machinery results in saving labor, our idea of labor will be radically changed. It will cease to be considered pain, for the truth will then appear that it is excess of labor which is painful. Wealth will not perform its true ministry until it is so distributed that the necessity of excessive toil shall disappear. Then, and not till then, will the thought that labor and pain are bound together in the constitution of things be remembered among the superstitions of the past. Then, and not till then, will man have entered into the possession of that liberty which is his by nature of his manhood and rendered possible by the service of inventions.

The chief difficulties in discussing questions of such grand proportions as the one now claiming our attention is that they quickly pass beyond what we are accustomed to regard as the range of our own personal influence, and we, consequently, cease to feel any very direct responsibility for what the outcome may be. Or, should it happen that our temperament be of that peculiarly serious cast which renders it imperative for its unfortunate owner to carry the destinies of the world on his puny shoulders, the chances are that, as a result of contemplating the great possibilities of our civilization and the dangers by which it is beset, we shall fall into line with that most disagreeable of all social humbugs—the professional reformer. Now, I should regard it as a misfortune if my emphasis of the wonderful possibilities of the present lead to either of these results, and in order to guard against such a perversion of reason, and at the same time to render our theme practical in its bearings, it may be well, passing over the many difficult and technical problems which beset economists and statesmen, to consider the lesson which this theme has for the simple, cheerful, pure-minded, ordinary folk. For if the common people can be brought to think rightly respecting the ministry of wealth, the intricate social and

industrial problems will be put quickly into the process of self-solution.

As a starting-point in this personal unfolding of our theme, let us turn to the words of the poet already quoted. He does not, be it remembered, content himself with saying that labor should be pleasant in the doing, but adds that nothing should be made by man's work which is not worth the making, or which must be made by labor degrading to the worker. Consider for a moment this claim by putting it to yourselves. Should work not be worth the doing? Can men enjoy work which is not worth the doing? Can one expect the growth of a noble character, which without doubt is the ultimate end of the ministry of wealth, when all the working-hours of the week are given to labor which has no rational purpose? The dignity of man may be preached from all the pulpits of the land, but mankind can never be brought to appreciate the essential worthiness of life until all have work that is worth the doing, and so manifestly worth the doing that its worthiness may be seen of all.

It may not be easy, imbued as we are with that monstrous idea that the social function of the rich is to eat cake that the poor may find bread, to distinguish between what is worthy and what is unworthy. In general, I should say that work alone is worthy which serves some useful purpose or satisfies some instinct of beauty; and that work is unworthy which ministers to vanity or ostentation, or which feeds personal ambition. If, now, it be true that men may be made worthy by doing worthy things, it is the consumer who stands at the source of influence, and who, by the character of his purchases, determines the character of the industrial organization. It is, therefore, in their capacity as consumers that the common people enter into their dominion of power. For, consider how easy it is to exert a positive influence on the future destiny of the race. All one has to do is to cultivate his own tastes so as to desire those things which are worthy because they are beautiful and useful. The soul grows to be like that upon which it feeds, and by demanding beauty and nobility for itself becomes beautiful and noble. But this is not all.

Forces are in this manner set in motion which cause others to work upon those things that minister to beauty and nobility, and they, in turn, through the influence of personal contact with the idea embodied in the things upon which they work, grow into a character like that which the purchaser set as a model for his own striving.

Profound ideas are frequently ignored because they are so simple; and it may be this is the fate of the thought I am now endeavoring to present. To enforce this thought by illustration brings us at once into the realm of homely things. When you purchase a gown, do not purchase shoddy, for in so doing you perpetuate the character of shoddy among the workers. When you furnish a house, do not contract with a decorator who is less artistic than yourself, but insist that he come to an appreciation of your finer sense of harmony as regards color and light. Should you desire furniture, do not permit the salesman to influence your purchase unless you are quite sure he is a man of taste, but, having studied the lines and curves which have proved restful to your mothers, your grandmothers, and your great-grandmothers, demand such lines and curves in what you buy.

In short, in all you purchase, remember this, that if you demand worthy things, the men who make them will grow into worthy lives, but if you demand what is unworthy, they will be condemned to wearisome labor in order to gain the means of continuing a life that has no worthy end. Work, then, must be made worthy for the sake of the worker. This is one of the great lessons which a consideration of the true ministry of wealth teaches.

There is, however, another lesson equally simple and equally profound. Let us remind ourselves that the mastery which man has achieved over nature cannot result in a soul-satisfying civilization unless the opportunities which it creates are enjoyed with some fair degree of equality by all members of society. If this be true, it is essential that opportunity to work under favorable conditions should be kept open for all men. It is this thought which lies at the basis of much of the criticism of present society, and which serves as the chief

complaint of socialists. The instruments of production, they say, are for the purpose of securing the means of satisfying developed wants. This, and this only, is the service of wealth; and when, by virtue of ownership over the instruments of production, the industrial organization is made subservient to ambition, it is perverted to an end for which there is no rational justification. It is not right, assert these critics, that a few men should lie in the path of progress and, like sponges, absorb to themselves all the increments of developing industry. All who have studied socialistic schemes or read socialistic dreams will remember how they provide that, after a man has toiled for a certain number of years, the duties which he performs are made lighter, until finally, in the evening of life, he is freed from all but optional work. I am confident this idea of a social organization has greater merit than the one realized in our present society, according to which a man works the harder the older he grows, until he comes to be simply a working machine; and, as an advocate of the philosophy of individualism against socialism, I am forced to ask if there is no way by which this socialistic idea of leisure with declining years may be realized under the present legal structure of society. It is no reply to say that men are now at liberty to give up work when they have accumulated sufficient for the means of living, for the habit contracted during formative years of life is so strong it cannot be broken. It is in the spirit of the age to overwork.

As the matter appears to me, there is a way by which this ideal may be realized, and, as in the case of worthy work, the influence upon which reliance must be placed is in the keeping of the common people. What the world needs at the present time more than anything else is the development of the amenities and courtesies of life. It is the gospel of beauty rather than the gospel of duty which fits the requirements of our times. If life could be made pleasant, so that business would be an adjunct to living rather than, as in so many cases, living an adjunct to business, the industrial phase of social activity might be confined to its proper place, and wealth become the means of attaining a better civilization. At present,

men do not work simply to satisfy the requirements of highly developed wants, but to gain and maintain a place of authority in business society. It is not wealth for which men strive, but riches; it is not the desire to satisfy normal wants that serves as the motive to industry, but the ambition to be accounted wealthy. It is this which explains why our marvellous industrial organization has been prostituted to personal ambition rather than to the more rapid elevation of the standard of rational living.

There is but one way by which all this can be changed, and that is by making the desire of a pleasant life supplant the passion of accumulation. When the claims of domestic happiness are so strong, or the charms of social intercourse so fascinating, that they take precedence as motives of conduct over the desire of accumulation, industrial society will take upon itself a new character. Men will no longer continue to accumulate beyond the requirements of rational living, but, having provided for themselves, will step aside and give opportunity to others. This they will do, not from any sense of moral duty, but because they desire to reap the rewards of their labor in the pleasure of living. And so I assert again, it is the gospel of beauty and not of duty which the world needs at present.

It is, of course, impossible, from what has been said, to appreciate in all its bearings so profound a subject as the social ministry of wealth; but it is believed a few thoughts of the humbler sort have been brought into prominence. In the first place, we are enabled by the foregoing analysis to appreciate the true dignity of a business career. It is the inventors, and the men who have a talent for industrial combination, who have laden these times with such marvellous possibilities. It is for us to understand this, and to live such lives that these possibilities may be realized. It is these same men, also, who have created the industrial conditions in which labor may be severed from pain and mankind freed from the drudgery of toil. It is for us to infuse such a spirit into living that the accretion of power brought with machinery can be the heritage of all men. For we must

not forget that the development of a civilization with a high idea of living is the true ministry of wealth.

More practical in its bearing is the thought that, so interlaced are the industrial relations of modern times, one's character can diffuse itself through one's purchases, and, by directing labor to this or that channel of activity, elevate or degrade the character of the laboring population.

But profounder than all else is the last consideration to which our analysis leads. A new form of slavery seems to be born of modern industry,—the slavery of the business man to the fascination of his business. The evil results of this are manifold. Not only is it misery for the man when at last the competition of younger men drives him from the street where his life has been spent, but so long as business ambition is stronger than any other motive in life, the commercial forces which should distribute wealth and render the benefits of machinery general and equal in the community, cannot work in a normal manner. It is the most serious criticism which one can make on American civilization, that business men cannot retire from business because they have nothing to retire to: they have no interests but business interests, and no passion but the passion of accumulation. Wealth cannot serve as the basis of a soul-satisfying civilization so long as this remains true, and this will remain true until young men and young women are given a taste of the highest pleasures while their characters are yet in a plastic condition. A man of fortune, who desires to exert an enduring influence on his times, can do so by making ample provision for presenting the highest grade of music, drama, and art to the student at any of our great centres of learning.

In the town of Ann Arbor, to use a specific illustration, there gather each year between thirty-three and thirty-four hundred young men and women in pursuit of an education. They come from every State in the Union, but for the most part from the Middle and Western States. They are fired with an ambition to succeed in business or in the professions, but they have slight appreciation of the amenities, courtesies, and social pleasures of life. Many of these young

men will succeed during the next generation in making their fortunes, but, having made their fortunes, will not know how to occupy their time, except in continuous accumulation. Now, let it be assumed that opportunity be given them during their academic and university career of listening each week to the highest order of music, or of seeing from time to time the best that art can afford. Is it not certain that an avenue of enjoyment would be opened to them which would change the current of their lives? Is it not also certain that they would carry this acquired appreciation of what is truly beautiful to their homes, and so introduce into the western part of the United States a spirit which would ultimately change the character of the American people? I can conceive of no greater opportunity offered a wealthy man to direct the growth of American civilization than the one suggested above. It is by some such means, at least, that the wonderful facilities for the production of wealth which characterize the nineteenth century may be wrested from the service of degrading ambition and made to perform the social function to which the logic of history declares it is called.

HENRY C. ADAMS.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

STATE CREATION OF OLD AGE DISTRESS IN ENGLAND: AN ASPECT OF OLD AGE PEN- SIONS.

The Question at Issue.—The main question at issue is not one of ways and means, of the amount of taxation which would be necessitated, and of the method of administration required, should a State Endowment of Old Age be created in England. That question of taxation no doubt exists, but it is, after all, of minor importance, because it is in essence merely a question of readjustment. The burden is already borne by the community. Old age is, however inefficiently and unsatisfactorily, endowed at present. The old are main-